



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,116	07/19/2003	Sumit Agarwal	13914-032001 / 2003P00455	4446
32864	7590	11/15/2007	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			FADOK, MARK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/15/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/623,116	AGARWAL, SUMIT	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Mark Fadok	3625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Fadok (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Stephen Scheafer (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 01 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Scheafer called to discuss the restriction requirement mailed 9/10/2007. Mr. Scheafer indicated that he had never seen a restriction requirement as outlined in the examiner's restriction requirement and indicated that usually the examiner points to the drawings or embodiments in the specification and indicates items that are restricted to the disclosed embodiments. Mr. Scheafer indicated that having to identify which restricted claims belong to each embodiment would be difficult on his part. This the examiner believes would indicate that Mr. sheafer understands the burden placed on the examiner to examine the restricted claims in the office action mailed 9/10/2007. Mr. Scheafer asked if the provided restriction requirement was a newly sanctioned method by the Office. The examiner noted that the restriction requirement was made based on the examiner's understanding of the practices and procedures found in the MPEP and noted that if the applicant finds fault in the restriction requirement, he should respond in writing at which time a consideration of the arguments will be thoroughly conducted and a response forwarded in the next office action. The examiner also stated that the applicant must select a grouping even if a traverse is provided. Should the examiner maintain the restriction the examiner instructed Mr. Scheafer that a petition may be made to the Director for further consideration . .